

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IAJUAN P. STROMAN,
Petitioner,

No. C-14-2245 EMC (pr)

v.

SCHEDULING ORDER

DAVE DAVEY, Warden,
Respondent.

The Court recently determined that this case and *Varner v. Davey*, No. C 14-2218 EMC, were related cases, whereupon this case was reassigned to the undersigned so that both cases could be handled by the same judicial officer.

In the present action, Respondent requests that he be permitted to file a single answer to both Petitioners' petitions. That request is DENIED. (Docket # 8.) It is preferable for this Court and the Ninth Circuit to have separate documents for each of the two cases so that there is no confusion as to which argument applies to which Petitioner. Not only does it make a clearer record for the courts, it also is easier for a *pro se* Petitioner to understand the brief of Respondent when the brief applies only to his case. If there is as much overlap in Petitioners' claims as Respondent contends, preparing two answers and supporting briefs should not be an unduly taxing word processing chore.

In order to move this action toward resolution, the following briefing schedule is now set:

1. Respondent must file and serve upon Petitioner, on or before **January 9, 2015**, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be issued. Respondent must file with the

